

## REMARKS

Claims 2, 5, 7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant believes these claims to be statutory. However, the above amendments to these claims should make this issue moot.

Claims 2, 5-7, 9-10 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,606,609 to Houser et al. (Houser) and U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0008557 by Stefik et al. ("Stefik"). As established in Applicant's response of October 20, 2003, claims 2, 5-7, 9-10 and 14-20 have priority to at least as early as May 16, 1996 based on the Office's interpretation of these claims. Therefore, Stefik is not prior art to these claims. As a result, the rejection of claims 2, 5-7, 9-10 and 14-20, should be withdrawn. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houser, Stefik, and U.S. Patent No. 5,606,609 to Huntsman ("Huntsman"). In its rejection of claim 11, the Office primarily relies on the OLE functionality described in Houser, and secondarily relies on Stefik and Huntsman. None of the references, whether considered alone in combination, teach a "listener program for identifying a media object in an HTML document; and for inserting a handler into the HTML document in response to determining an object identifier computed from perceptible attributes of an image or audio signal in the media object" in combination with the other claim elements. Houser does not teach these elements. Houser inserts a security object, but does not insert the security object in response to determining an object identifier as claimed. Therefore, Houser's security object cannot correspond to the claimed handler. Houser extracts security information from a security object. But as argued previously, Houser's process of extracting security information does not involve inserting a handler into any form of document, much less an HTML document. At most, Houser extracts security information and displays some related information, and neither of these acts involve inserting a handler as claimed. Stefik and Huntsman do not teach these elements of claim 11 missing from Houser. One of skill in the art would not combine Huntsman with Houser because it provides no pertinent teachings regarding inserting a handler in an HTML document. The Office's reference to col. 4, lines 1-20 of Huntsman only refers generally to browser programs and provides no pertinent teachings regarding a listener program as claimed within an internet browser, nor does it provide teachings that would teach one of skill in the art to make and use such a listener program to insert a handler into an HTML document.

Stefik is cited as a basis for rejecting claims 11-13, but the Office provides no reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would combine it with the teachings of Houser and Huntsman. The Office has not established a basis for combining these references, and in addition, even when these references are combined, the combination does not have all of the elements of claims 11-13.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 22, 2007

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

CUSTOMER NUMBER 23735

Phone: 503-469-4800  
FAX 503-469-4777

By /Joel R. Meyer/  
Joel R. Meyer  
Registration No. 37,677